

Kentucky Agricultural Development Board

Minutes of the October Board Meeting

The regular meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Development Board was held on **Friday, October 18, 2002** at **10:20 a.m.** at the Kentucky History Center in Frankfort. Commissioner Billy Ray Smith, presiding, called the meeting to order, and the Secretary called the roll.

Members Present

Vickie Yates Brown, Daniel Case, Larry Clay, Susan Harkins, Sam Lawson, Sam Moore, Willa H. Poynter, Eddie Sellers, Commissioner Billy Ray Smith, Dean M. Scott Smith, and Smith Mitchell designee for Secretary Gene Strong.

Members Absent

Seth Conner, Wayne Hunt, Mike Slaughter, and Governor Paul E. Patton

Others Present

Staff – David Bratcher; Penny Cline; Sandy Gardner, Board Secretary; John-Mark Hack; DeVon Hankins; Bruce Harper; Jeff Harper; Bill McCloskey; Jeff Mosley; Angela Utterback; Steve Yates
Guests – Rick Alexander, CGC; Biff Baker, LRC; Betty Brown, CFA; Amy Carpenter, CFA; Ray Craxton, CFA; Carla Gerding, CFA; Phillip Sewell, CFA; Courier-Journal reporter; 32 WLKY camera/reporter

Notification of Media

Commissioner Billy Ray Smith received verification from John-Mark Hack that the media had received notice regarding the Agricultural Development Board meeting.

Welcome

Commissioner Smith welcomed everyone to the October meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 20, 2002 meeting were approved as presented.

Executive Director's Report

John-Mark Hack welcomed the Board and guests. Mr. Hack reminded guests to sign in and made a special welcome to Rick Alexander, the new Executive Director of the Commodity Growers Cooperative.

Mr. Hack noted that copies of the draft model programs had been passed out for the Board to continue discussion from the Project Review Committee meetings. *[A copy of each draft is on-file with the Board Secretary.]*

Commissioner Smith opened the floor for discussion on the *Hay & Grain Storage Program* draft.

Eddie Sellers asked about the strictness of the evaluation criteria for the hay & grain program, as compared to the other model programs, referring to the point system [p. 2, *Guidelines for Administration #5, item C*].

Vickie Yates Brown commented that she thought from the Project Review Committee discussion the Board would leave the point system up to each county. Ms. Brown asked for clarification of this point.

Mr. Hack noted that the model program would establish guidelines, but the counties could make those guidelines stricter, depending on their needs.

Joel Neaveill addressed Mr. Sellers' concerns. Mr. Neaveill noted that the intent of the item to which Mr. Sellers is referring is to encourage those who do not have any type of hay storage take priority over those that do. To address the concern that those who do have storage would be penalized, Mr. Neaveill noted that this would be up to the county by how many points they assign to that item.

Mr. Hack noted that some language needs to be clarified, for example, noting that these are "suggested guidelines."

Vickie Yates Brown noted that fundamental question is "how strict do we want the guidelines to be?" Are we just making suggestions that we would like the counties to use or are there things that "must" be included in their point system?

Dean Smith noted that the point is to add value to a farming operation; the counties ought to know what is best to get this done with regards to a points system.

Ms. Brown noted that there had been discussion at the committee meeting about including the conversion of existing structures (e.g. retrofitting tobacco barns) [p. 4].

Mr. Lawson wondered if there is a problem with "weighting" – putting more weight to certain things, pointing toward the greater need. For example, give more weight to conversion of existing structures; otherwise, these items could be added to the end of an existing program.

Mr. Hack asked if the Board would like to see something like "...the Board encourages the local administrators to reach farmers who aren't currently

employing best practices..." under item 5c on p. 2 and leave it to the county on the best way in which to do this. Or does it suffice to clarify the language?

Mr. Case agreed with the term "suggest" for the point system, since nobody knows the people in their areas better than the local council does.

Mr. Hack explained the thought behind why this program seems stricter than the other model programs. The prior model programs are not perfect; we recognize the need to reach farmers that have not yet participated.

Ms. Brown commented that having some kind of general guidelines of suggestions from the Board of what we would like to have allows us to have some input as they develop their criteria. Our suggestions aren't set in stone, but allow us to have some input in the development. Ms. Brown would like to have the program supply some suggested material.

Mr. Hack asked if the Board is comfortable with requiring that items 5 A & B on page 2 be mandatory criteria for this program and that the Board "recommends" the other evaluation criteria as they [the county administrators] develop their program criteria.

Mr. Neaveill noted that the above items would be requirements for both the hay and the grain portions of the program. Mr. Neaveill also reminded the Board that the "county council" would not be the ones evaluating individual applications to the program; it would be the local program administrator that would set the criteria and use it.

Mr. Hack stated that staff would incorporate the suggestions made in the Project Review Committees and the suggestion made today. A draft will be circulated as early as possible, within the next week or two, with the intent of a final copy being presented for review and decision at the November Board meeting.

Commissioner Smith asked, referring to item 5 D on page 2, who would be determining "right/wrong time" for hay testing. Bill McCloskey and Dean Smith commented that the best time is just before it is fed, but in practicality can be done after harvest. Dean Smith noted the big issue is "to test or not to test," not the timing of the test. Commissioner Smith suggested that the program say more points will be given for proper testing, but not necessarily a requirement.

Commissioner Smith closed discussion on the *Hay & Grain Program* draft.

Commissioner Smith opened the floor for discussion on the *Local Direct Marketing Program* draft.

Mr. Hack noted that all of the recommendations from the Project Review Committees are included in the document passed out today.

Mr. Sellers noted that his council had asked about a few farmers pulling together and working together cooperatively. Could they benefit from this program? Is five the magic number?

Ms. Hankins addressed Mr. Sellers' question/concern, referring to page 2 *Participant Eligibility Requirements*.

Ms. Brown asked about the "group related initiatives" [pg. 2, item 2 under *Participant Eligibility*].

Ms. Hankins addressed those concerns. The group related initiatives encompass both formally organized "Farmers' Markets" and other multi-farmer initiatives.

Dean Smith asked about municipal markets not having a cap & whether or not we want to have a model program for municipal markets, especially if they are big projects.

Ms. Brown shared her concerns with this program and coordinating it with the greater marketing effort.

Mr. Hack provided a definition for "municipal markets" as staff sees it. Mr. Hack asked the Board if they would be comfortable keeping the "municipal market" piece in the model program if the "multi-county" wording were deleted and a dollar cap was provided. Staff will consult with Anna Lucio, Kentucky Department of Agriculture (KDA), to come up with a recommendation for a cap for this piece.

Ms. Hankins reiterated the extent to which Ms. Lucio has been involved in the development of this program to compliment and enhance programs and services already offered by the Department of Agriculture.

Commissioner Smith asked if this program was restricted to horticultural type products, or could other products, such as meat, be included. Ms. Hankins confirmed that any Kentucky produced commodity or value-added product is eligible. She also noted that many at the focus groups were interested in expanding their product line to include things such as meat, aquaculture and eggs.

Ms. Brown asked about tightening the language under the *Products Eligible* section to reflect that the value-added product needs to be made from a Kentucky produced commodity.

Mr. Sellers asked for clarification of the \$25,000 cap (per county vs. per market). Ms. Hankins noted that the \$25,000 cap was initially for municipal markets to keep them from blending into the regional market concept. Caps were imposed to keep this program on the local, direct side of the market facility concept, not the regional.

Sam Lawson applauded the staff effort to develop something around such a multi-layered and complex issue, but this program is still confusing as setup with dealing with individuals and groups.

Ms. Hankins asked the Board if they wanted three separate documents, one for each of the areas. Mr. Lawson said three documents would help.

Commissioner Smith asked who would be eligible to administer this program on a local basis (e.g. Farm Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, etc.). Mr. Hack confirmed that the same could administer the program.

Ms. Hankins noted that she would break up the program into three, remove the cap from the group initiative and work on the municipal aspect.

Mr. Hack noted that he has heard mixed messages with regards to the municipal markets. Mr. Hack proposed leaving in the municipal component and raising the cap on the group and municipal components in proportion to the economic impact of this size initiative.

Mr. Lawson asked if the individuals could use their money for their “farmers’ market booth.” Ms. Hankins said that that was not the intent of the individual portion. Focus group participants intended farmers’ market enhancements to be used for the entire market, not the individual booths.

Mr. Lawson also had concerns with logos materials being cost-shared (shirts, aprons, hats, etc.) [p. 6].

Ms. Hankins noted that this program is confusing. She also shared her concerns about a possible conflict with this program and the Regional Marketing effort. If “municipal market” is a “farmers’ market,” then let’s just call it a “farmers’ market.” Ms. Hankins also noted that she has issue with market development section. The cost-share for individuals is too low.

Mr. Moore commented on the “county of residence” statement mentioned for where to apply for funds. Ms. Hankins addressed why this was added. Smith Mitchell and Commissioner Smith suggested to change it to state that an individual can receive fund from one county, not specifying “county of residence or business.”

Ms. Hankins asked for clarification of whether or not “municipal markets” were to be pulled from the program. Staff will define it and leave it in the program and make the adjustments for the cap.

Commissioner Smith asked the Board to communicate any other suggestions they have as they read through the program over the next few weeks.

Commissioner Smith closed discussion on the *Local Direct Marketing Program* draft and yielded the floor to Mr. Hack.

Mr. Hack presented “Recommending a Strategy: Taking Kentucky’s Agricultural Development Efforts to the Next Level.” *[A copy of the presentation is on file with the Board Secretary.]* The presentation outlined the current state of agricultural development efforts and recommendations to sustain future efforts with regard to structure and organization.

Dean Smith shared his concerns with the risk of opening a legislative discussion on this subject and with the risk of budgetary impact.

Ms. Brown stated that this was a great plan. She asked that as a next step we coordinate with other related groups (e.g. Farm Bureau, KY Chamber of Commerce) and get them on board in lobbying for the effort to broaden our support base.

Ms. Brown also noted that, in relation to the other tobacco producing states at the NGA forum in early October, Kentucky has given the lion's share of their money to farmers. Other states have used most of the money to alleviate budget deficits, especially Medicaid. Kentucky is looking at a \$220 – 250 million shortfall in Medicaid. Ms. Brown is concerned that if we do nothing, then legislators will look to other states for what they are doing. She feels we need to be forward thinking and go in [to the 2003 Session] with a plan, rather than sitting back and waiting.

Mr. Lawson complimented Mr. Hack on the plan and noted that this [plan] is where we have been headed since day one. Mr. Lawson believes that the Finance Authority may be what we [the Board] will be remembered for 10 years down the road; it gets right to the individual farmer. Mr. Lawson noted that it would be better to have a plan that the Board is emotional about, rather than keeping with the *status quo*.

Commissioner Smith noted that, if adopted, this would not be an ending, but would be the second phase of the agricultural development process with access to capital.

Dean Smith noted that there are two issues – access to capital and legislative change for organizational structure – which do not necessarily have to go together.

Mr. Moore applauded Mr. Hack for looking ahead. Mr. Moore noted that we should not underestimate the support, legislatively, for this effort. KY Farm Bureau has made this its number one priority and has the Agricultural Development on the forefront of any candidate forum that KFB sponsors.

Ms. Brown noted that we have two options, in light of Mr. Moore's statement, 1) do we leave well enough alone and just stay a granting entity or 2) do we show that this is where we want to be in the future.

Mr. Moore noted that we need to do our groundwork first.

Mr. Lawson stated that, if everything else works, he strongly endorses the plan.

Mr. Hack asked the Board to think about this plan and consult with others and get their feedback. Then in November come back to the table and discuss what it is you [the Board] want to formalize.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there would be a draft resolution in had at the November meeting or would we [the Board] be starting from scratch. Mr. Hack said that staff could draft a resolution based on the presentation and feedback from Board members between now and the next meeting. This draft resolution would then be modified, as necessary, at the November Board meeting.

Referral of October Projects¹

Mr. Hack presented projects A2002-0567 to A2002-0602 for referral to the Board's Project Review Committees. Sam Lawson moved that "projects A2002-0567 to A2002-0602 be referred the Board's Project Review Committees;" Willa H. Poynter seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Approval of Model Programs²

Mr. Hack submitted projects A2002-0022, A2002-0135, A2002-0433, A2002-0529, and A2002-0572 as projects meeting the model **Agricultural Diversification Program** guidelines. Mr. Moore moved that same be approved as model Agricultural Diversification programs; Ms. Poynter seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Hack submitted projects A2002-0533, A2002-0537, A2002-0539, and A2002-0554 as projects meeting the model **Forage Improvement & Utilization Program** guidelines. Ms. Harkins moved that projects same be approved as model Forage Improvement & Utilization Programs; Larry Clay seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Hack submitted projects A2002-0531, A2002-0532, A2002-0541, A2002-0553, and A2002-0569 as projects meeting the model **Genetics Improvement Program** guidelines. Ms. Harkins moved that same be approved as a model Cattle Genetics Improvement Program; Mr. Clay seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Hack submitted projects A2002-0548, A2002-0567, and A2002-0573 as projects meeting the model **Goat Diversification Program** guidelines. Dean Smith moved that projects same be approved as model Goat Diversification Programs; Mr. Case seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Hack submitted projects A2002-0530, A2002-0534, A2002-0540, A2002-0552, A2002-0555, and A2002-0570 as projects meeting the model **Cattle Handling Facilities Program** guidelines. Mr. Case moved that projects same be approved as model Cattle Handling Facilities Programs; Ms. Poynter seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Committee Reports

Blue Project Review Committee

Vickie Yates Brown reported for the Blue Project Review Committee (PRC). Ms. Brown noted that the Blue PRC is presenting two projects for funding consideration.

Ms. Brown presented application **A2002-0528**. The project received a high priority from Bracken County. The applicant, **Bracken County Agricultural Advancement Council, Inc.**, requests \$1, 750 in county Agricultural Development Funds. Funds are being

¹ A detailed list of the referred projects is attached as Appendix A.

² A detailed list of projects funded under each model program category is attached as Appendix B.

requested to purchase a cattle-working trailer and equipment (wheels & hitches) to make their vegetable equipment portable. The addition of the trailer and the wheels & hitches will make the equipment more accessible to the producers of Bracken County. Currently, only those producers who have their own trailer can use this equipment. Ms. Brown reviewed the terms and conditions for this project. Ms. Brown moved that project A2002-0528 be approved for \$1,750 in Bracken County Agricultural Development Funds; Mr. Case seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Ms. Brown presented application **A2002-0535**. The project received a high priority from Breckinridge County. The applicant, **Breckinridge County FFA**, requests \$20,000 in county Agricultural Development Funds. Funds are being requested for the expansion to the youth livestock and safety programs sponsored by the Breckinridge County chapter of FFA held at their recently constructed sales facility. Funds would be used for equipment to hold youth livestock programs. FFA agrees to permit other entities in the county to use the facility as a "load out" facility for small ruminants, such as goats. Ms. Brown reviewed the terms and conditions for this project. Ms. Brown moved that project A2002-0535 be approved for \$20,000 in Breckinridge County Agricultural Development Funds; Mr. Case seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Red Project Review Committee

Sam Lawson reported for the Red Project Review Committee (PRC). Mr. Lawson noted that the Red PRC is presenting one project for funding consideration.

Mr. Lawson presented application **A2002-0496**. The project received a high priority from Hickman County. The applicant, **Hickman County Agricultural Development Council**, requests \$4,000 in county Agricultural Development Funds. Funds are being requested to contribute to the Purchase Area Aquaculture Cooperative (A2001-0087). They are proposing that \$2,000 go towards marketing and \$2,000 go towards the purchase of equipment. Mr. Lawson reviewed the terms and conditions for this project. Mr. Lawson moved that project A2002-0496 be approved for \$4,000 in Hickman County Agricultural Development Funds; Ms. Harkins seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Review of Amendments

Mr. Hack presented the following amendments for approval.

Application **A2001-0310, Woodford County Beef Cattle Association**, was originally approved for \$94,250 on June 15, 2001 for the Cattle Genetics Program. The applicant requests a decrease in the project funds of \$25,000. This amount is to be reallocated to A2001-0601. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to this project to \$69,250.

Application **A2001-0601, Woodford County Agricultural Advancement**, was recently amended and approved for \$234,000 on September 20, 2002 for the Agricultural Diversification Program. The applicant requests an increase in the project funds of

\$25,000. This amount is to be reallocated from A2001-0310. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$259,000.

Application **A2001-0348, Rowan County Fiscal Court**, was originally approved for \$75,000 on August 17, 2001 for the Cattle Genetics Program. The applicant requests a decrease in the project funds of \$17,500. This amount is to be reallocated to A2002-0126. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$57,500.

Application **A2002-0126, Rowan County Fiscal Court**, was originally approved for \$20,750 on March 15, 2002 for the Cattle Handling Program. The applicant requests an increase in project funds of \$17,500. This amount is to be reallocated from A2001-0348. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$38,250.

Application **A2001-0635, Green River Beef Improvement Group, Inc.**, was originally approved for \$63,150 on October 19, 2001 for the Cattle Genetics Program in Ohio County. The applicant requests a decrease in project funds of \$29,000. This amount is to be reallocated to A2001-0637. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$34,150.

Application **A2001-0637, Green River Beef Improvement Group, Inc.**, was originally approved for \$31,575 on October 19, 2001 for the Cattle Handling Program in Ohio County. The applicant requests an increase in project funds of \$29,000. This amount is to be reallocated from A2001-0635. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$60,575.

Application **A2001-0894, Laurel County Cattlemen's Association**, was originally approved for \$100,000 on February 15, 2002 for the Cattle Genetics Program. The applicant requests a decrease in project funds of \$41,000. This amount is to be reallocated to A2002-0516 [approved 9/20/02]. Approval of this request will amend funds allocated to the project to \$59,000.

Application **A2002-0200, Triple T Farms**, was originally approved for \$74,500 on September 20, 2002. This request is to decrease the state funds for this project by \$2,349.77 to reflect the county contribution from A2002-0568 (Pulaski Co.). This action will amend state funds allocated to this project to \$72,150.23.

Mr. Case moved that the above amendments be approved; Mr. Moore seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Recommendations for No-Funding³

Mr. Hack presented projects A2001-0720, A2002-0213, A2002-0288, A2002-0536, A2002-0545, A2002-0547, A2002-0549, A2002-0550, A2002-0556, A2002-0564, and A2002-0565 as projects recommend for no-funding by the project review committees. Mr. Lawson moved that no funding be awarded to same; Mr. Clay seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

³ Detailed list of projects for a no-funding recommendation listed in Appendix C.

Other Business

Commissioner Smith passed around a brochure for the *Employer's Summit on International Labor* in November and invited members of the Board to attend. *[A copy of the brochure is on file with the Board Secretary.]*

Commissioner Smith passed out a statement regarding the Kentucky Department of Agriculture's (KDA) revised plan for marketing. Commissioner Smith reviewed the document with the Board. KDA intends to present the revised plan to the Board in November. *[A copy of the draft document is on file with the Board Secretary.]*

Closing Remarks

Mr. Hack announced that lunch is available for the Board.

The next meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Development Board will convene at 1:30 p.m. on Friday, November 15, 2002 at KY Fair & Expo Center's South Wing Board Room. Note time and location of meeting subject to change; ample notification will be given if such a change occurs.

The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

PRESIDING OFFICER: _____

SECRETARY: _____

APPENDIX A: *Referred to Project Review*

Applications A2002-0567 to A2002-0602

<i>App. #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Project Type</i>
A2002-0567	Central Kentucky Meat Goat Producers, Inc.	Goat Diversification Program
A2002-0568	Triple T Farms	Project
A2002-0569	South Eastern Kentucky Agriculture Development Assoc.	Genetics Improvement
A2002-0570	South Eastern Kentucky Agriculture Development Assoc.	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2002-0571	Muhlenberg Cattlemen's Assoc.	Project
A2002-0572	Pendleton County Diversification Council	Agricultural Diversification
A2002-0573	Pendleton County Diversification Council	Goat Diversification Program
A2002-0574	Duplicate	Forage Improvement
A2002-0575	Aquaculture of Kentucky, Inc.	Project
A2002-0576	Henderson Community College	Project
A2002-0577	Garrard County Dairy Producers	Project
A2002-0578	Magoffin County Cattle Association, Inc.	Project
A2002-0579	Lincoln County Livestock Improvement Cooperative Association Inc.	Forage Improvement
A2002-0580	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Forage Improvement
A2002-0581	Cartersville Slaughter and Processing Plant, Inc.	Project
A2002-0582	Jackson Purchase Foundation, Inc.	Project
A2002-0583	Wurtland Middle School	Project
A2002-0584	McKell Intermediate School	Project
A2002-0585	Morgan County Conservation District	
A2002-0586	Jessamine County Sheep and Goat Producer Association	
A2002-0587	FFA Alumni	
A2002-0588	Cartersville Slaughter and Processing Plant, Inc.	Project
A2002-0589	Shelby County Chamber of Commerce/Commerce Enhancement Corporation	Project

APPENIDIX A: Referred to Project Review

<i>App. #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Project Type</i>
A2002-0590	Owsley County Conservation District	Project
A2002-0591	Owsley County Conservation District	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2002-0592	Owsley County Conservation District	Project
A2002-0593	Christian County Cattlemen's Association	Genetics Improvement
A2002-0594	Clinton County Ag. Advancement Council	Agricultural Diversification
A2002-0595	Scott County Beef Improvement Association	Project
A2002-0596	Chrisman Mill Vineyards Inc.	Project
A2002-0597	Lawrence County Agriculture Development & Economic Council, Inc.	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2002-0598	Lawrence County Agriculture Development & Economic Council, Inc.	Agricultural Diversification
A2002-0599	Scott County Beef Improvement Association, Inc.	Project
A2002-0600	Michael Palmer	Project
A2002-0601	Central Kentucky Livestock Bedding	Project
A2002-0602	Castle Hill Farm Inc.	Project

APPENIDIX B: *Model Program Lists*

Agricultural Diversification

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds Requested</i>
A2002-0433	Buffalo Trace ADD	Fleming	\$50,000.00
A2002-0022	Jessamine County Sheep and Goat Producers	Jessamine	\$1,060.00
A2002-0135	Jessamine County Vineyard Assoc. Inc.	Jessamine	\$45,000.00
A2002-0529	Mountain Cattlemen Association	Morgan	\$11,587.50
A2002-0572	Pendleton County Diversification Council	Pendleton	\$60,000.00
Sub Total			\$167,647.50

Forage Improvement

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2002-0537	Allen County Conservation District	Allen	\$60,000.00
A2002-0533	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Daviess	\$20,000.00
A2002-0554	Hardin County Beef Cattle Association	Hardin	\$3,320.75
A2002-0539	Owen County Farm Bureau	Owen	\$6,000.00
Sub Total			\$89,320.75

Genetics Improvement

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2002-0532	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Daviess	\$30,000.00
A2002-0553	Hardin County Beef Cattle Association	Hardin	\$3,410.50
A2002-0531	Mountain Cattlemen Association	Morgan	\$48,925.00
A2002-0541	Owen County Farm Bureau	Owen	\$53,121.94
Sub Total			\$135,457.44

APPENDIX B: *Model Program Lists*

Goat Diversification Program

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2002-0567	Central Kentucky Meat Goat Producers, Inc.	Casey	\$40,000.00
A2002-0548	Lincoln County Goat & Sheep Producers	Lincoln	\$30,000.00
A2002-0573	Pendleton County Diversification Council	Pendleton	\$20,000.00
Sub Total			\$90,000.00

Handling Facilities Cost Share

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2002-0552	Barren County Cattlemen's Association	Barren	\$32,000.00
A2002-0534	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Daviess	\$20,000.00
A2002-0555	Hardin County Beef Cattle Association	Hardin	\$2,243.75
A2002-0530	Mountain Cattlemen Association	Morgan	\$75,190.00
A2002-0540	Owen County Farm Bureau	Owen	\$100,000.00
A2002-0570	South Eastern Kentucky Agriculture Development Assoc.	Pulaski	\$100,000.00
Sub Total			\$329,433.75

APPENIDIX C: *Recommendations for No Funding*

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>
A2001-0720	Progressive Beef, LLC	Christian
A2002-0213	Hawk Crest Farms, Ltd.	Lincoln
A2002-0288	Ag Spray Equipment Inc.	Christian
A2002-0536	Christian Way Farm	Christian
A2002-0545	Nicholas County Fiscal Court	Nicholas
A2002-0547	Cartersville Slaughter and Processing Plant, Inc.	Madison
A2002-0549	Cartersville Slaughter and Processing Plant, Inc.	Lincoln
A2002-0550	Hawk Crest Farms, Ltd.	Lincoln
A2002-0556	Carter County Conservation District	Carter
A2002-0564	Foothills Goat Association, Inc.	Meniffee
A2002-0565	Foothills Goat Association, Inc.	Montgomery